## Case 2:04-cv-01753-RSL Document 39 Filed 05/03/05 Page 2 of 2

Plaintiff has not identified any manifest error<sup>1</sup> warranting reconsideration. The prior 1 ruling properly allowed plaintiff to obtain discoverable evidence in support of his claim that defendant breached an express or implied promise by failing to apply its fair treatment policy. What is more, the Court did not misstate the holding in Bulman v. Safeway, Inc., 144 Wn.2d 335, 340-41 (2001). The Court properly cited Bulman in support of its conclusion that a party must first be aware of information before it can claim to have relied on that information. 6 7 For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification (Dkt. # 37) is DENIED. 8 9 DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of May, 2005. 10 11 12 13 United States District Judge 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 <sup>1</sup>Manifest error is defined as "an error that is plain and indisputable, and that amounts to a complete disregard of the controlling law or the credible evidence in the record." Black's Law Dictionary

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION

582 (8th ed. 2004).

26